

E. 20 ,277

MAY 5 1961

Why Aim at Intellectuals?

There seems a tendency in some circles to lay responsibility for the Cuban fiasco at the feet of the intellectuals who accompanied President Kennedy to Washington.

This is a generalized charge that, from all of the facts available, doesn't square with what actually happened. The Central Intelligence Agency and the Joint Chiefs of Staff were admittedly among advisers to the president in what finally was his own decision. This doesn't indicate that the professors from Harvard, or graduates of that institution, have taken over all branches of the government — certainly not the military.

It is typical of American people —and it may be assumed that this extends to newspaper columnists and editorial writers—to scoff at intellectuals whenever the opportunity arises. But it seems a bit far-fetched to suggest that the Cuban operation, the decision for which was based ~~essentially on intelligence and military considerations~~, was the product of the so-called intellectuals' thinking.

Senator John Fulbright, after hearing testimony of such officials as CIA Director Allen Dulles and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, concluded that the mistake was by the whole administration and not by any particular group. Although some high officials have attempted to suggest that they, on being consulted, were opposed to the operation, the best information is that there were no dissenting votes, either from those new to the ad-

ministration or those who have been on the scene for some years.

Any attempt to blame a single group, including the liberal-minded intellectuals, is treading on ground where prejudices may overcome sound judgment. The facts seem to indicate that the hard-headed career men erred as disastrously as did anyone else.

The same differences that marked the regular session still prevail.

Two years ago, when a special session was called, it was suggested by one of the legislators that only the committees which were involved in ironing out the differences ought to be called to the capitol. The rest of the lawmakers could go home until there was something for them to do.

This again looks like a good suggestion. There is only a limited number of bills that stand between the legislators and the completion of their work. Many of the members of both houses have little to do during such a period.

If an arrangement could be worked out whereby the whole legislature was convened only when there was a vote to be taken, time could be saved and —what is equally as important — it would cost the taxpayers less money.

An extra session is expensive, especially when it is considered that all of the work could have been done during the regular term if there were less politics and more effort to seek a reasonable solution.

Why Need Everyone?

The pace of the Minnesota legislature, despite the fact that it is in special session, doesn't appear to have been stepped up materially during the past two weeks.